REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 27, 2003 (Paper No. 22). Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 to 14, 22, 23, 25, 28 to 34, 42, 43, 45, 48 to 54 and 62 to 64 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 22 and 42 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 8, 12 to 14, 22, 28, 29, 33, 42, 43, 45 and 48 to 54 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 to 14, 22, 23, 25, 28 to 34, 42, 43, 45, 48 to 54 and 62 to 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,940,065 (Babb) and U.S. Patent 5,777898 (Teterwak). Reconsideration and withdrawal is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The present invention generally concerns coordinate correction technology in which coordinate correction parameters for nonlinear conversion are calculated, and addresses the inaccuracies of nonlinear correction of input coordinates in conventional systems.

To address the foregoing problem, the present invention displays a plurality of reference points on a coordinate input means. Using correction parameters calculated based on user-designated coordinates received from a user designation of the reference points displayed on the coordinate input means, it is possible to correct device characteristics of the coordinate input means such as position aberration.

Among its many features, the present invention includes the features that a user designates reference points, each of which indicates a position for user-designated coordinates, in an order determined by the user from a display of reference points not yet

- 18 -

designated, and it is discriminated which of the displayed reference points is the one that corresponds to received user-designated coordinates. Each user-designated coordinate is kept, and coordinate correction parameters are calculated, which are also kept. The coordinates are corrected using the kept coordinates correction parameters and a nonlinear conversion.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 defines a coordinates correction apparatus. A coordinate input means is placed on a display, and a display control means controls display of a plurality of reference points on the display such that all of the reference points yet to be designated are displayed for designation in a user-determined order, the reference points indicating positions for user-designated coordinates on the coordinate input means. A coordinates reception means receives coordinates designated for the displayed reference points by user via said coordinate input means. A discriminating means discriminates which reference point corresponds to the user-designated coordinate received by said coordinate reception means, from the displayed reference points. A coordinates keeping means keeps the user-designated coordinate as the coordinate corresponding to the reference point discriminated by the discriminating means. A parameter calculation means calculates coordinates correction parameters for nonlinear conversion, based on the coordinates kept by said coordinate keeping means. A parameter keeping means keeps the calculated coordinates correction parameters for nonlinear conversion, and a coordinates correction means corrects the coordinates inputted via said coordinates input means by the nonlinear conversion using the coordinates correction parameters kept by the parameter keeping means.

The applied art, namely Babb and Teterwak, are not seen to teach or to suggest the above-identified features. It is conceded by the Office Action, at pages 3 to 4, that Babb does not disclose displaying reference points indicating positions for user-designated coordinates. Since Babb is not seen to teach displaying reference points, it is also not seen to teach or to suggest controlling display of a plurality of reference points on a display such that all of the reference points yet to be designated are displayed for designation in a user-determined order. Further, Applicant submits that neither Babb nor Teterwak, either alone or in any permissible combination, is seen to teach or to suggest controlling display of a plurality of reference points on a display such that all of the reference points yet to be designated are displayed for designation in a user-determined order.

Teterwak is seen to describe aligning a coordinate system of a digitized panel with the coordinate system of a display. See Abstract. To align the coordinate systems, Teterwak is seen to describe a calibration procedure, beginning at col. 9, line 37 and shown in Figure 6, wherein a number of reference points are displayed in a predetermined consecutive order, and as each point is displayed, the user is asked to place a stylus on the displayed point. See col. 9, lines 52 to 57. After the stylus placement for one of the consecutively-displayed reference points (e.g., point 66 of Figure 7) is detected, the next reference point (e.g., point 68 of Figure 7) is added to the display. Thus, Teterwak is seen to describe displaying the reference points in succession so that the user is forced to select a reference point in the order in which the reference points are displayed. Nothing in

Teterwak is seen to describe controlling a display such that all of the reference points yet to be designated are displayed for designation in a user-determined order.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 22 and 42 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 65621 v 1

- 21 -